

REMARKS

By the present amendment, Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 10. Claims 1-14 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 10, and 13 are independent claims.

In the recent Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 6, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as being anticipated by Greves. Claims 4, 5, 7, and 10-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greves in view of LoCascio. Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greves in view of LoCascio, and further in view of Feldman. Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greves in view of Feldman. The Examiner's indication of the allowance of Claims 13 and 14 over the prior art of record is noted with appreciation.

With regard to the prior art rejections of record, Applicant will advance arguments hereinbelow to delineate the manner in which the presently claimed invention is patentably distinguishable from the cited and applied prior art. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

The primary reference to Greves discloses an illuminated pet leash comprising, in one embodiment, an elongated strap of leash material (i.e., having the flexibility and tensile strength to withstand the rigors of a pet in tow). Attached to the leash material is at least one strip of electroluminescent lamp elements distributed along the length thereof. A power supply is provided for energizing the electroluminescent lamp elements along the strip. In this embodiment, the leash structure of Greves is a non-retractable leash. In an alternate embodiment, Greves discloses a retractable leash arrangement. The leash arrangement includes a housing having a handle grip. Disposed internally of the housing is a spool dispensed/recoiled leash strap, described as being commonly known in the art. Disposed externally of the housing is an illumination arrangement for

the exterior of the housing. The illumination arrangement provides a myriad of electroluminescent lamp design patterns for causing the exterior housing body to glow.

There appears no disclosure in Greves that anticipates Applicant's illuminated retractable leash as specifically defined by the present claims. Further, assuming that Greves suggest the integral attachment of the electroluminescent strip to the strap does not anticipate the claimed electroluminescent wire because the electroluminescent strip of Greves is disclosed as a plurality of electroluminescent lamps, distributed along the length of the strip. Thus Greves produces a segmented illumination. On the contrary, the originally claimed electroluminescent wire is defined as the actual leash material, and is uninterruptedly illuminated along the entire length thereof. The electroluminescent wire of the instant application provides a soft glow from the wire structure and produces a unitary glowing element from end to end. In addition, the device of the alternate arrangement of Greves does not have any illumination of the leash strap whatsoever. The disclosure of Greves implicitly distinguishes illuminating the non-retractable strap with the electroluminescent strip from illuminating the housing of a retractable leash strap with a design pattern of electroluminescent lamps. These separate embodiments are clearly described as being mutually exclusive of one another, and there appears no suggestion in Greves that the illuminating feature from the non-retractable embodiment could be interchanged with the retractable leash embodiment. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the structures disclosed in Greves do not anticipate Claims 1-3, 6 and 9, as alleged by the Examiner. Further, the realistic teachings afforded by Greves, when taken alone, precludes any argument of obviousness.

With respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), Applicant contends that none of secondary references supplement the above noted deficiencies of Greves. Aside from Applicant's own disclosure, there is no guidance or motivation found in either of LoCascio, and Feldman, alone or in combination, that would have led one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure

Application Serial No.: 10/772,367
Art Unit: 3643

Attorney Docket No. 24250.00
Confirmation No. 6789

of Greves in order to arrive at the structural cooperation of elements recited in Applicant's claims. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of references relied upon of record are insufficient to render Claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 11 obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103.

Applicant has amended independent Claims 1 and 10 to clarify the originally claimed elements. Applicant has also provided substantial arguments that distinguish Applicant's uniquely claimed structural cooperation of elements from the prior art of record. Applicant respectfully submits that for at least these reasons, Claims 1-12 are also allowable over the prior art applied of record.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. If such is not the case, the Examiner is requested to kindly contact the undersigned in an effort to satisfactorily conclude the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard C. Litman
Registration No. 30,868
(703) 486-1000

RCL:DHT:wse